

SUPPORT FOR THE AMENDMENTS

Applicants have amended the claims for clarity. Accordingly, support for the amended claims can be found in the same claims, as originally filed. Applicants have also amended the specification to include a reference to the claim of priority. Support for this amendment can be found in the Application Data Sheet filed with the application.

No new matter has been added. Claims 1-37 remain pending in this application.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

At the outset, Applicants wish to thank Examiner Coleman for indicating that the present claims are free of the prior art. Applicants submit that, in view of the present amendments and remarks, all of the present claims are patentable.

At the outset, Applicants note that a complete reference to priority was included in the Application Data Sheet ("ADS") filed with the application on December 1, 2003. Applicants further note that under 37 C.F.R. § 1.78(a)(2)(iii), the reference to priority may be made either in the specification or in an ADS. As such Applicants need do nothing further to be entitled to their claim of priority. In any event, Applicants have amended the specification to explicitly include the reference to priority.

The rejection of Claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, has been obviated by appropriate amendment. As the Examiner will note, the claims have been amended such that they are free of the criticisms outlined on pages 6 and 7, of the specification. Accordingly, the rejection is no longer tenable and should be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, has been, in part, obviated by appropriate amendment and is, in part, respectfully traversed. First, as the Examiner will note, Applicants have rewritten Claims 24 and 25 as proper method claims. Second, Applicants submit that composition Claim 22 and 23 comply fully with the

enablement requirement. In particular, the Examiner's attention is directed toward page 3, lines 7-14, of the present specification, where it is disclosed that antagonists to calcium channels are considered to be effective against diseases of the digestive tract. The Examiner's attention is also directed toward the in vivo results which are reported on pages 108-110, of the present specification.

For all of these reasons, the rejection should be withdrawn,

The objection to Claims 7-22, 24, and 25 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) has been obviated by appropriate amendment. As the Examiner will note, Applicants have amended the claims to remove all improper multiple dependencies. Thus, the objection is no longer tenable and should be withdrawn.

Applicants submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and early notification of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Stephen G. Baxter
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 32,884

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220